

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of January 13, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-18 remain in this application.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter, but otherwise stand "objected to" for depending upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,359,436 to Dichter et al.

Claims 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,739,917 to Shu et al.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dichter.

Claims 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dichter in view of Shu.

Comments/Arguments

Currently amended claim 1 recites "receiving input color data expressed in a first color space defined by a plurality of first components" and "converting the received input color data to intermediate color data expressed in an intermediate color space defined by a plurality of second components, wherein at least one of the second components is different than one of the first components." Dichter fails to teach the foregoing.

Notably, the input color space for the transformation element 2 is CMY, and the output color space of the transformation element 2 is CMY. Note, the output color space has no component that is different from the input color space, contrary to the express terms of claim 1. That is to say, the C component of the output color space is also included in the input color space, the M component of the output color space is also included in the input color space, and the Y component of the output color space is also included in the input color space. While the values of the respective components may be different (i.e., as denoted by the subscript "NEW" as opposed to "ORIG"), the components themselves are nevertheless the same. In

short, Dichter fails to explicitly disclose or fairly suggest this feature of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 defines patentably over the reference, along with claims 2-6 depending therefrom.

Likewise, currently amended claim 7 recites “converting input components corresponding to a color in a first color space to intermediate components in a second color space, where the second color space includes at least one intermediate component that is different from the input components.” As already pointed out above, Dichter teaches that the input color space for the transformation element 2 is CMY, and the output color space of the transformation element 2 is CMY. This is contrary to the express terms of claim 7. Again, the values of the respective components may be different, but the components themselves are nevertheless the same. Clearly, as shown in FIGURE 1 of Dichter, the same set of CMY components (albeit of different values perhaps) are input to and output from the transformation element 2, and it is these same identical components that are used by element 5 to generate the output black component.

In short, Dichter fails to explicitly disclose or fairly suggest the aforementioned feature of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 defines patentably over the reference, along with claims 8-14 depending therefrom.

The rejection of claim 15 is also hereby traversed. Currently amended claim 15 recites “a receiver that receives input color separations in the input color space; a converter that converts the input color separations to intermediate color separations; and an achromatic component generator in data communication with the receiver and the converter, the achromatic component generator calculating an achromatic color separation from functions including at least one input color separation and at least one intermediate color separation.” Shu fails to teach the foregoing.

Note, the Office Action alleges that element 50 of Shu corresponds to both the claimed converter and the achromatic component generator. However, the same element 50 cannot be fairly equated with both of the claimed elements. The claimed converter generates or outputs intermediate color separations, and the claimed achromatic component generator calculates its output from functions including at least one of the intermediate color separations. Accordingly, if element 50 were to correspond to both claimed elements, then its own output would have to loop or feedback into its input. FIGURE 4 clearly shows no such feedback. In short, Shu fails to explicitly disclose or fairly suggest both of the aforementioned elements of

claim 15. Accordingly, claim 15 defines patentably over the reference, along with claims 16-18 depending therefrom.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-18) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment A. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call John P. Cornely, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

April 13, 2005
Date



John P. Cornely
Reg. No. 41,687
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582